



Greedy Institutions: The Importance of Institutional Context for Teaching in Higher Education

Author(s): Mary C. Wright, Carla B. Howery, Nandini Assar, Kathleen McKinney, Edward L. Kain, Becky Glass, Laura Kramer, Maxine Atkinson

Source: *Teaching Sociology*, Vol. 32, No. 2 (Apr., 2004), pp. 144-159

Published by: American Sociological Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3211457>

Accessed: 02/08/2010 12:49

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=asa>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Sociological Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Teaching Sociology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

ARTICLES

GREEDY INSTITUTIONS: THE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT FOR TEACHING IN HIGHER EDUCATION*

This article focuses on how the institutional contexts of colleges and universities shape these "greedy institutions." We look at the current social, political, and economic trends affecting all postsecondary institutions, specifically the forces that encourage "greediness." We examine the literature on structural arenas that influence teaching in higher education, including type of institution and departmental level characteristics, considering how the varied structural features of institutions and departments shape the conditions of academic life and demands placed on faculty. We identify the features of the institutional context that can help faculty manage demands on their time and enhance teaching and learning. The article closes with identification of areas for future inquiry and a challenge to sociologists to contribute to an examination of the contextual forces that shape the work lives of faculty and students.

MARY C. WRIGHT

University of Michigan

NANDINI ASSAR

*Virginia Polytechnic Institute
and State University*

EDWARD L. KAIN

Southwestern University

LAURA KRAMER

Montclair State University

CARLA B. HOWERY

American Sociological Association

KATHLEEN MCKINNEY

Illinois State University

BECKY GLASS

State University of New York at Geneseo

MAXINE ATKINSON

North Carolina State University

THE LATE HANS MAUKSCH, in establishing the original American Sociological Association Projects on Teaching in 1974, set forth three foci: the content we teach, the training we need to teach effectively, and the con-

texts in which we teach. Each topic became a task group that worked mightily to produce materials and offer workshops. It is the third topic that remains the least developed yet the most sociological. "To a significant—indeed crucial—degree, the teacher's performance, behavior and orientation are the products of contextual forces and conditions. Teacher performance and teaching process can be viewed as dependent variables, and the institutional, disciplinary, and societal forces as independent variables" (Mauksch and Howery 1986:73; see also Goldsmid and Wilson [1980] 1985 and McGee 1971). More recently, Kuh and Hu (2001) find that "institutional context [has an effect on] learning productivity." Their study found that different types of institutions had different levels of "student quality of effort, engagement in good prac-

*The genesis of this paper came at a workshop on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning at James Madison University, July 20-23, 2000, supported by the American Sociological Association, The Carnegie Academy for the Advancement of Teaching, and James Madison University. This manuscript represents a collaborative effort; order of authorship was determined through a random draw. Please address all correspondence to Mary Wright, Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, 3300 School of Education, Ann Arbor, MI 48109; e-mail: mcwright@umich.edu.

Editor's note: The reviewers were, in alphabetical order, Steven Brint, James Dowd, and Teresa Sullivan.

tices, and gains from college" (p. 22).

In this paper, we take up Mauksch's challenge and examine the scholarship on structural arenas that influence teaching in higher education. We draw on scholarship in and about sociology as well as the general literature on teaching and learning at the college or university level. Studying formal organizations, Coser (1974) coined the term "greedy institutions" to refer to organizations that place high demands on employees. Greedy institutions "seek exclusive and undivided loyalty, and they attempt to reduce the claims of competing roles and status positions on those they wish to encompass within their boundaries" (p. 4).

The greediness of postsecondary institutions is evident in the multiple, and often exclusive, roles that are expected of faculty, including but not limited to: excellence in classroom teaching, accessibility to individual students outside of class, high-quality advisement, productivity in traditional research or other creative endeavors, acquisition of internal and external funding, service to the discipline, service to the department, service to the institution, and service to the community (McMillin and Berberet 2002; Schuster and Wheeler 1990). The demand characteristic of these occupational components is evident by the extent to which these roles are found regularly in faculty evaluation systems (Braskamp and Ory 1994; Fairweather 1993; Seldin 1999).

Even institutions that allow significant autonomy in the ways in which roles are performed may be greedy in the amount of time required for successful role performance. Faculty workloads considerably exceed a typical workweek. In reviewing past theory and research on faculty workloads, Meyer (1998) concludes that "whatever the type of institution, faculty seem to work over 40 hours per week at their jobs and often exceed 50 hours per week" (p. 40). This greediness varies by institution type, ranging from an average of 47 hours per week at public two-year institutions to 57 hours per week at public research institutions (p. 41). As expectations develop for

increased faculty-undergraduate contact, writing requirements and measurable student learning (Kuh and Hu 2001), the greediness of postsecondary institutions for faculty time can be expected to increase.

Our goal is to provide a review of some of the theory and research in these arenas and suggest directions for future inquiry. This article is organized into four sections. We start by examining some of the forces that lead to institutional "greediness" by locating the system of higher education within the historical and contemporary social world of the United States: Briefly, what are some of the social, political, and economic trends affecting all postsecondary institutions, albeit in varied ways? Our second and third arenas are the institution and department: How do varied structural features of institutions and departments shape the conditions of academic life and the types of demands that are placed on faculty? Finally, we turn our attention to features of the institutional context that help instructors manage the many demands on their time and enhance teaching and learning.

As broad as the topic of institutional context is, it is necessary to narrow our treatment to a manageable size. Related institutional features or trends beyond the scope of this article include increases in developmental education and academic support services for students, general education and other curriculum reform, increased emphasis on diversity and multiculturalism, demographic changes in students, and renewed interest in service learning opportunities (Calhoun 1999; DeZure 2000). Additional institutional features that have been addressed comprehensively in *Teaching Sociology* include the impact of technological advances on instruction (Benson et al. 2002), assessment of student learning (Weiss et al. 2002), and faculty evaluation (Lucal et al. 2003).

Our conclusions point to the continued relevance of Mauksch's original call for examination of "the products of contextual forces and conditions." Indeed, in several areas, there is limited scholarship on which

to base conclusions about the impact of structure and context on teaching and learning (see Pescosolido and Aminzade 1999). We hope to stimulate further interest and work in the scholarship of teaching and learning from a structural perspective.

SOCIETAL TRENDS AND INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

In their classic study of academic hiring at prestigious institutions, Caplow and McGee (1958) describe a postsecondary educational marketplace where teaching is superceded by a candidate's other qualifications and social ties: "Where men [and women] are hired to teach only on the basis of their research productivity, what happens to teaching? With the exception of some humanities departments and a few atypical natural science and social science departments, the answer to this query takes two general forms: (1) Teaching doesn't matter - it isn't important; and (2) There's nothing to worry about - any Ph.D. can teach" (pp. 135-6).¹ In 1973, Peter Blau argued that universities that train doctoral students emphasize teaching much less than do colleges because of differing promotion procedures and social groups that create an environment prioritizing research.

However, in the past decade, the postsecondary environment has been affected by a trend, partly precipitated by Boyer's (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered*, to recapture teaching as a valuable faculty activity and to recognize that faculty benefit from being taught how to teach. This trend is evidenced by increasing numbers of Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) programs at institutions and departments around the nation, increases in faculty development centers and programs, changing faculty attitudes about undergraduate education (Wilson 2002), new attention to teaching within the faculty roles and rewards structure (e.g., Arreola 2000), and a reconceptualization of teaching as scholarly activity (e.g., Hutchings and Shulman

1999). While the American Sociological Association has been ahead of the trend by formally supporting the teaching of sociology for almost 30 years, its workshops, consultants, journal on teaching (*Teaching Sociology*), teaching materials for sale, and section on teaching and learning are characteristic of what other disciplinary associations are now offering or developing for their members (Carnegie Academy 2002).

But the question is, have institutional priorities changed significantly in the past decade as a result of these trends? Or, has emphasis on good teaching simply been added to faculty members' research responsibilities at research institutions? Conversely, has a higher bar for teaching excellence been set at "teaching institutions" without institutional support for attaining the higher standard?

Several pieces of evidence provide some answers to these questions. Milem, Berger, and Dey (2000) find that "faculty at nearly every type of institution are spending more time engaged in research and more time teaching and preparing to teach" (p. 467). These researchers compared data on faculty time allocation from institutions in five Carnegie classifications from 1972 to 1992. Their findings include "a general and significant increase in the amount of time spent engaged in research in all four-year institutions" (p. 465), and "[a]cross the system of higher education...a significant increase in the amount of time faculty reported allocating to teaching and preparing to teach" (p. 467). Thus, it is not surprising that faculty in UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute 1998/99 survey identified "lack of personal time" and "time pressures" as the two top sources of stress in their lives (*The Department Chair* 2000:17). This suggests that increasing demands on faculty have not been accompanied by structural changes providing support for those tasks.

Additionally, market pressures and political calls for accountability are placing demands on institutions and instructors. Market forces and business practices influence decisions within the institution that can af-

¹See Burke (1988) for a replication of this study that finds similar recruitment patterns.

fect staffing and other resources needed for teaching and learning. According to data collected by the American Association of University Professors on faculty retrenchment, in the decade from 1980 to 1990, resource disparities widened as wealthy academic units received additional funding and the budgets of poorer areas were cut (Slaughter 1993). Faculty in fields positioned close to the market and located within the broad political discourse on "productivity" were generally retained, while those who were unable or unwilling to participate in the discourse of the market, productivity, and competitiveness were cut (Slaughter 1993).² This movement of resources could have direct negative implications for teaching and learning in sociology and other disciplines not typically considered to be highly related to the market and productivity. Additional market pressures include the competition from providers of advanced learning opportunities that are outside traditional higher educational institutions (DeZure 2000).

Related to these trends are the pressures for accountability from various societal constituencies, including legislators and accreditation agencies (Cross 2001; DeZure 2000). Some of these pressures are particularly important for public institutions. States are now drafting plans intended to achieve clearly defined objectives, with mechanisms designed to hold higher-education officials responsible for meeting specific goals. For example, the latest revision of Missouri's plan links the amount of state money public colleges receive to how well they meet criteria such as raising graduation rates. Virginia's Blue Ribbon Commission on Higher Education calls for linking state support to efficiency and encourages closer ties between colleges and businesses. The goal, in each case, is to measure the value added by the institution (Schmidt 2000). Both these demands, market and political, have only exacerbated traditional pressures on the professoriate and have meant that newcom-

ers enter the academy under greater stress to perform than did their predecessors.

INSTITUTIONAL-LEVEL CHARACTERISTICS

Within this societal context, postsecondary institutions face challenges and opportunities that are specifically related to their particular institutional characteristics. Although some argue that "the research model has come to pervade all types of institutions of higher education" ("Why Is Research the Rule?" 2000:53), there are indications that striking differences still exist in how academic roles are operationalized by institutional type. For example, a 1998 study finds that seven of eight research university faculty—but fewer than one in five liberal arts professors—indicated that research is the primary standard for promotion and tenure (Finkelstein, Seal, and Schuster 1998). Thus, it is not surprising that research university faculty report the least consensus—and community college faculty the most—that teaching effectiveness is the primary criterion for promotion at their institutions (Leslie 2002).

The impact of size and mission is perhaps more significant than the shared facets of the faculty role among schools of differing size. The recent National Survey on Student Engagement (2001) finds that these structural features significantly affect student learning, through outcomes such as level of academic challenge, active and collaborative learning, student interactions with faculty members, enriching educational experiences, and supportive campus environment. Nonetheless, the greediness of academic institutions remains a commonality; the demands on faculty time are high, frequently conflicting, and often problematic to good teaching, even in "teaching-oriented" institutions.

One way of gauging variation and change in the type of greediness found in institutions of higher learning is to examine advertisements for academic positions. Rau and Baker (1989) compared job listings in the

²For salary trends, see also Scott and Berman (1992).

ASA Employment Bulletin in 1977 and 1987 and concluded that there was a decline in the importance of teaching and an increase in the importance of research and grant activity across institution type during that time period. Adding 1997 to the analysis, however, Kain (2000) reported two important findings: First, across institution type, the most recent decade had seen a significant increase in the proportion of advertisements that list both teaching and research in the job description. Second, there is a strong linear relationship between institution type and the probability that the job description will list only teaching activities. Fewer than 1 in 10 of the research university advertisements were this type, while fully 7 in 10 of the Baccalaureate II advertisements listed only teaching. However, Mahaffy and Caffrey (2003) found that while most departments in sociology indicate a preference for teaching experience, "few request specific evidence of teaching effectiveness in their job advertisements" and, furthermore, "research-oriented institutions are less likely to request teaching credentials" (p. 203). These analyses of job advertisements illustrate that, from the very beginning of the hiring process, type of institution affects the demands that are placed on faculty members.

We now turn to three different institutional types as we discuss further how institutional culture, mission, type, and size affect demands on faculty and influence teaching. These three categories are ideal types; in reality, institutional type is better understood as situated on a continuum or in a Venn diagram rather than as discrete.

Teaching-Oriented Institutions

Liberal arts and community college teachers are immersed in cultures where collective goals take precedence over individual ones. Borrowing from Gouldner's (1957) typology, a greater proportion of faculty at these institutions would be classified as "locals," with an eye to the immediate college context, rather than as "cosmopolitan," with an orientation to one's discipline. Caught up in

an open-ended service mission and an all-encompassing commitment to students' well being, locals play an almost endless number of roles. This sense of intense personal service nonetheless may be coupled with ambiguity about how it will be rewarded, how it is linked to professional growth, and whether it is possible "to do it all" (R. A. Wright 1986; Tierney and Rhoads 1994).

Small-college teachers juggle dual reference groups. Already burdened with many expectations for ways to contribute to college life, the faculty member must repress disciplinary identity for the good of the college, operate under the governance of a dean outside his/her discipline, and find professional support in interdisciplinary groups. At the same time, professional socialization and a sense of identity and growth in the discipline are necessary for scholarly contributions and desirable for self-esteem derived from professional identity (see Sacks and Weiner 1978).

While most small colleges are teaching institutions, administrators recognize that the professional rewards of each discipline are gained by research activity. From the 1970s to the 1990s, the greatest proportional increases in reported time spent on teaching occurred in liberal arts and two-year colleges, but these institutional types also witnessed a coincident rise in research hours (Milem, Berger, and Dey 2000). A recent survey of baccalaureate-granting institutions found that faculty at selective liberal arts colleges were most likely to have both strong research and teaching orientations (Astin 2000). Thus, small colleges are characterized by a dual value structure.

Some small-college faculty handle the competing demands of this dual structure by retreating from the discipline altogether, not attending professional meetings, not writing for scholarly publications, or throwing all their eggs in the basket of service to the college. But for many, there is a continual struggle to maintain and build connections to their disciplines while meeting the demands for service and commitment to individual students made by their institutions

(Bourque 2000). Moreover, while teaching is in the institutional reward structure as the activity of paramount importance for small-college faculty, there may be few resources to assist faculty to improve their teaching (Schuster and Wheeler 1990; Spangler et al. 1991).

Research-Oriented Institutions

Faculty at research institutions may be classified as “cosmopolitan,” with disciplinary-based orientations that guide their teaching and other professional work (Gouldner 1957; see also Tierney and Rhoads 1994). In cosmopolitan, research-oriented institutions, teaching accomplishments remain private and less important for promotion and tenure standards (Seldin 1990). Indeed, research universities are much more ambiguous in their institutional messages about teaching expectations and norms than are other types of institutions (Braxton, Bayer, and Finkelstein 1992; Braxton and Berger 1999; Quinn 1994; Woods 1999). Few research universities establish and maintain clear, shared criteria that would constitute a standard for good teaching (Tierney and Bensimon 1996). When asked “How important are observations of your teaching by colleagues and/or administrators for granting tenure in your department?” those in research universities were least likely to find it important, compared to faculty in all institutional types (Boyer 1990). In their sample of tenure and promotion policies at representative colleges and universities nationwide, the Harvard Project on Faculty Appointments found *no* Research I institutions that required, or made optional, a classroom observation, and only one Research II institution provided it as an option for tenure review (O’Meara 2000).

With an institutional reward structure that requires faculty to create an independent research program and seek external funding, devoting time and energy to teaching can be difficult. Indeed, from the early 1970s to 1990s, research university faculty reported that while time allocated to teaching dropped insignificantly, hours devoted

to research increased by 6 percent (Milem, Berger, and Dey 2000). In the last decade, role demands may have grown: One recent study finds that research universities have been “requiring students to do more reading and writing and making faculty members more accessible” (Kuh and Hu 2001:22). Without a concomitant de-emphasis on research in the reward structure, increasing stress on teaching at research universities will only add to their greediness.

The particular nature of greediness at research-oriented institutions creates particular problems for new faculty: Braxton and Berger (1999) indicate that new faculty in research institutions adjust with less facility to their instructional roles than do new faculty in teaching colleges. This difficulty may stem from new faculty’s low ratings of their department’s collegiality and lack of teaching advice (Boice 1991). Further, research university department chairs, who could direct new faculty to the teaching resources they need, often perceive themselves as being more supportive than do new faculty (Whitt 1991).

Comprehensive Institutions

Some would argue that the greediest institutions of all are the comprehensive institutions, or what the Carnegie Foundation now classifies as “master’s colleges and universities.” Carnegie defines this category as “institutions [that] typically offer a wide range of baccalaureate programs and...are committed to graduate education through the master’s degree” (Carnegie Foundation 2000). There is evidence that these institutions expect from their faculty the service and faculty-student contact characteristic of small teaching colleges as well as the research productivity and external grants acquisition (albeit in reduced quantity) characteristic of research universities (e.g., Brownlee and Limon 1990). Indeed, from the early 1970s to the 1990s, faculty at comprehensives reported that the time they allocated to research grew by 20 percent, even while time devoted to teaching also increased significantly (Milem, Berger, and

Dey 2000).

The comprehensive colleges and universities have a unique history in that from the mid-1960s to mid-1970s they changed from being primarily teacher-training schools and technical institutes to taking on a variety of roles related to community needs, changing labor markets, and declining finances within higher education (Finnegan and Gamson 1996; Harclerod and Ostar 1987; Spangler et al. 1991). The comprehensives took on, or continued, the task of providing professional and applied programs (Geiger 1980), but at the same time began hiring more faculty with Ph.D.s and began valuing scholarly research in addition to prior emphasis on teaching excellence (Finnegan and Gamson 1996).

In the 1997 National Survey of Faculty, significant proportions of faculty at master's institutions reported that research activity counts more toward faculty advancement than it did five years ago (Huber 1998). The survey also found that faculty at baccalaureate and master's institutions spent more hours preparing to teach than at other classifications of colleges and universities, including community colleges (Huber 1998). Further, this faculty taught more hours per week than instructors at every other classification except community colleges.

Comprehensive colleges and universities have increasing student populations, especially from underrepresented groups and academically underprepared groups (Spangler et al. 1991). These changes in student populations have coincided with an increasing demand for quality teaching, in an era of declining resources. As Spangler et al. note, "The desire for quality exists not only among students but also faculty, administrators, governing boards, and legislators, while its nature and measurability remain in dispute and the funds to provide it become increasingly scarce in many states" (p. 25).

The decline in resources, coupled with competing emphases on quality teaching and greater research productivity, contributes to a greediness in the comprehensives that led

Spangler et al. (1991) to observe, "Faculty members at comprehensive institutions will probably have to undertake research as best they can in addition to their teaching loads" (p. 32).

While the character or priority of the demands on faculty time and abilities varies by type of institution, the evidence suggests that expectations are rising in all institutions (e.g., Milem et al. 2000; Huber 1998; Kuh and Hu 2001; Tierney and Rhodes 1994). Whether new expectations for quality teaching are added to traditional expectations for disciplinary research and grant-writing or new expectations for research are added to traditional expectations for quality teaching, the result is an increase in faculty workload that fits Coser's (1974) definition of "greedy institution."

DEPARTMENTAL-LEVEL CHARACTERISTICS

When we move from the institutional to the departmental context, a variety of factors come into play, given the importance of the department culture and the department as a decision-making unit. In all but the smallest colleges, the department most immediately influences faculty and student experience; institutional policies and practices are filtered through and interpreted by colleagues in one's department (Edwards 1999). Although faculty members often explain the variations within their college or university based on *disciplinary* differences, they also are shaped by *departmental* histories, traditions, norms, and composition.

Departments often perceive the larger institution to be greedy and may give lip service to "protecting their own," but many of the demands on faculty originate with their departments or are implemented by the departments. Departmental personnel committees, along with chairs, are the first tier in communicating performance standards and determining how much is enough for contract renewal, promotion, and discretionary pay increases. However, one frequently neglected topic in this discussion is

the standard for effective teaching (M. Wright 2002).

A decade ago, an American Sociological Association/Association of American Colleges task force wrote *Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major*, addressing curriculum planning within departments to achieve "study in depth" (Eberts et al. 1990). At least 6 of the 13 recommendations to departments specifically focused on teaching and learning issues, such as alignment between students' needs and departments' goals and practices, promotion of active learning, and development of data analysis, communication, and higher-order thinking skills.

The ASA Council endorsed the report and encouraged departments to adopt its recommendations. From the very beginning there were hints that implementation of these recommendations might not be easy. A number of factors constrain departments from working toward the goals of the report, including:

- 1) a lack of agreement on the proper content of the introductory courses, 2) the way we currently teach introductory sociology, 3) pressure from the University to service as many students as possible, 4) the popularity of sociology courses as upper-division electives, and 5) our willingness to allow professors to teach whatever they wish. (Schwartz 1990:488)

Many of these barriers point to the need for more discussions of instructional issues. However, the level of collegial trust within departments is a factor in initiating and sustaining such discussions. If faculty members do not trust their colleagues, they may fear that attention to good teaching will raise suspicions of inadequate attention to scholarship or that voicing concerns about teaching indicates a deficiency in teaching ability (Benezet 1977; Kramer 2001; Tierney 1997). A high level of mutual trust is needed to collectively pursue discussions of (and perhaps research in) teaching (e.g., a "discipline-based faculty group" advocated by Cross and Steadman 1996:xiii). The

level of trust needed is possibly higher for teaching discussions than for discussions of research where a product is created that can be separated from the researcher in a way that teaching cannot be separated from the teacher.

Departments' demographic profiles (e.g., racial/ethnic and gender diversity) may influence trust among colleagues (Kanter 1977; R. Kramer 1995). For example, Boice (1993) found that white male newcomers were, on average, more involved on their campuses than were women or faculty of color. Furthermore, he found that such involvement was an important predictor of faculty success. Men and women, at both junior and senior faculty levels, reported significantly different experiences in some areas of faculty life related to professional achievement. In their study of campus climate at one large university, Bronstein and Farnsworth (1998) found that gendered experiences provided one set of challenges to developing trust. The sense of exclusion that women and racial/ethnic minorities often experience (Alexander-Snow and Johnson 1999; Tierney and Bensimon 1996; Trautvetter 1999) is detrimental to forming a trusting social network for teaching.

These findings point up the difficulty of cracking the departmental culture of "don't ask, don't tell" when it comes to teaching. Since departmental (let alone inter-departmental) instructional discussions are relatively rare, the norm of teaching as personal and private must be very strong. Leaving teaching as an unshared and unanalyzed activity contributes to the greediness of the institution and departments. When the amount of time and mental effort required to teach well remains unarticulated, faculty time outside class is defined as "free" for committee meetings, grant writing, research projects, curriculum development, and even "extra service" courses (Berberet and McMillin 2002).

The consequences of unmet institutional expectations for quality performance in teaching, research, grant writing, service, and other demands on faculty time are cur-

rently less severe for tenured faculty than for junior faculty. While their inability to meet expectations or to sufficiently document that they have met expectations may deprive tenured faculty members of promotion, their employment remains secure. However, with continued requirements for accountability, calls for post-tenure review, and pressures to take on new roles (e.g., fundraising, alumni relations, and community outreach), the effects of institutional greediness on senior faculty may become more similar to those for junior faculty.

CONTEXTS THAT ENHANCE TEACHING AND LEARNING

Given the demands placed on faculty and the constraints on their instructional roles, what does encourage the professoriate to spend time and effort on teaching? In this section, we focus on three contextual features that enhance teaching and learning: instructional development initiatives, influences on collaborative teaching culture at the department level, and national organizations and initiatives committed to the scholarship of teaching. How these structural features are integrated into the professional life of the faculty and whether they are perceived as adding to, rather than assisting with, the demands on faculty time and effort varies by individual institution and department. Systematic study is needed to investigate this probable variation.

Instructional Development

Instructional development refers to a wide range of activities, at a variety of levels, through which an institution aims to improve teaching and curriculum and, subsequently, to enhance student learning. The structure of such activities ranges from very informal and decentralized (such as faculty teaching the same course who meet over coffee to discuss teaching issues) to more formal and centralized (as in institutes offered by teaching centers), and from short-term (e.g., a one-hour presentation) to long-

term (e.g., year-long mentoring programs) (Chism and Szabo 1996; Paulsen and Feldman 1995; Seldin 1995; Weiner 1990; W. Wright 1995). Research shows those faculties who utilize instructional development centers or are involved in inter-departmental mentoring programs tend to bypass many instructional difficulties (Boice 1992; Cox 1997).

Surveys of faculty developers indicate that successful practices are closely tied to supportive institutional characteristics: recognition of teaching in tenure and promotion decisions, deans/heads who foster importance of teaching responsibilities, centers to promote effective instruction, mentoring programs and support for new faculty, and faculty grants to devise new approaches to teaching (Wright and O'Neil 1995; see also Chism and Szabo 1996; Eleser and Chauvin 1998; Sandy et al. 2000; Stanley, Porter and Szabo 1997; Woods 1999).

Related to the emergence of instructional development committees and centers on campuses is the recent attention being given to systems of faculty roles and rewards (Hutchings and Shulman 1999). This interest in rethinking faculty evaluation systems probably derives from a convergence of recent trends, including the "rediscovery" of teaching as an important activity, assessment (as distinguished from evaluation), and the market pressures mentioned earlier. At least one of the proposed systems (Arreola 2000) allows for individually weighting the various faculty roles according to the faculty member's strengths, encourages the use of multiple sources of information about teaching effectiveness, and suggests that the first step in using the system is for the institution to examine what it values. If this is characteristic of the "new" development and evaluation systems, it may provide an important step toward managing the greedy institution's demands on the faculty.

Department Culture

While campus-wide resources can make a

significant contribution to the practice of teaching, there is no substitute for locally informed conversation and collaboration at the department and program level. Structured planning meetings with department chairs (accompanied by meaningful rewards), opportunities for team teaching, frequent discussions of pedagogy, staffing of introductory courses by senior faculty, and peer observation have been shown to play a powerful role in constructing a culture of teaching (Boice 1993; Cuban 1999; Smith and Smith 1993; Tierney and Rhoads 1994). Institutions and departments need to “provide consistency, clarity, and communication of reasonable performance expectations,” “ensure formal orientation, mentoring, and feedback,” “offer flexibility and choice...in career tracks,” and “afford support for ongoing self-reflection and dialogue with colleagues” in order to maintain commitment and enthusiasm in their new faculty (Trower, Austin, and Sorcinelli 2001:6; see also Braskamp and Ory 1994). Graduate student completion rates are higher in departmental environments that students perceive as “warm and supportive”; departments that were characterized “efficient and professional” had lower completion rates (Ferrer de Valero 2001).

Four principles of successful collaboration are necessary to facilitate trust and productive interaction among departmental colleagues (Chrislip and Larson 1994). First, it is important to bring people together to the table to solve problems and to keep everyone at the table. Second, establishment of confidence and participants’ ownership in the credibility and effectiveness of the process is critical. Third, everyone (including those who hold divergent views) in the relevant community of interests must be included—in this case, everyone who has a stake in improving and understanding teaching and learning. Fourth, confidence can be sustained by protecting participants’ belief in the process—relying upon the group to come up with appropriate responses and actions (Chrislip and Larson 1994). This process is possible when all participants are

willing to look beyond narrow personal interests to the common good. If departmental collaboration about teaching is structured in this way, it might foster trust, a greater openness to discuss teaching, and may lead to rethinking greedy departmental and institutional structures and rewards.

Teacher preparation programs and informal curricula modeling collegiality have developed recently in many Ph.D.-granting schools. They indicate a departmental culture that recognizes the value of teaching and the need for growth and development of graduate students as future professionals. These programs—along with efforts to increase collegiality through workshops, study groups, faculty mentoring relationships, and colloquia—have a significant influence on intellectual growth, confidence, satisfaction, and career aspirations of graduate students (Keith and Moore 1995; Sullivan 1991).

Research from the early 1990s found that the higher the prestige of the sociology department (using the *U.S. News and World Report’s* rankings), the less likely it was to have a teacher preparation or development program (Klug 1991; Pescosolido and Milkie 1995). However, this relationship may have changed dramatically in the last few years. Eighty-four percent of the top 51 departments report some sort of instructional preparation (Atkinson 2001). While it is difficult to judge the quality of these programs, their increased presence may indicate a cultural shift in departments viewing such preparation as desirable. Additionally, through the nationwide Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) program, participating graduate students are gaining exposure to a variety of department cultures and the faculty person’s multi-faceted role within them.

Professional Organizations with Commitments to Teaching Scholarship

Boyer (1990), his collaborator R. Eugene Rice (Director of the Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards for the American Association of Higher Education), and others have called for a new framework of scholar-

ship with more fluid and supportive domains that include teaching as scholarly activity, open to peer review. This is an important way for the demands of teaching to be legitimized within the greedy institution. Peer-reviewed scholarly products of teaching give faculty professionally validated visibility and portable credentials (Shulman 1989, 1993).

Many disciplinary associations, including the American Sociological Association, evidence an increasing interest and involvement in quality teaching and in teaching as a scholarly activity (Huber and Morreale 2002). While the ASA has long been supportive of teaching, some recent events suggest wider notice and acceptance of teaching as a valued activity and as a source of scholarship among its members. For example, the ASA section on Undergraduate Education recently changed its name to the Section on Teaching and Learning in Sociology. A thematic session on the scholarship of teaching and learning is planned for the 2004 national meeting. In 2000, for the first time, the Southern Sociological Society's annual meeting theme was "The Scholarship of Teaching," and this regional organization recently created its first award for teaching excellence.

The Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL), in conjunction with other organizations, offers both tangible and philosophical support for individuals and campuses to advance the conversation about the role of teaching within the institution. The Carnegie-Pew Scholars program provides financial support for outstanding faculty to design research and investigate significant issues in the teaching and learning of their fields, and it provides the structure for these scholars to form an ongoing community to further advance the profession of teaching and enhance learning. Casting a wider net, CASTL offers networking opportunities and small grants to scholarly and professional societies to help them support their members in the scholarship on teaching and learning.

Finally, at the institutional level, the CASTL Teaching Academy Campus Program, coordinated by the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE), offers networking opportunities and a three-step process to assist campuses that want to publicly commit to fostering and supporting the scholarship of teaching and learning (Carnegie Academy 2002). In the latest phase of the Campus Program, cross-institutional partnerships to promote and apply the scholarship of teaching and learning are being created and involve numerous institutions working in "clusters."

Additional opportunities that cross both institutional and association boundaries are taking place. For example, coalitions of postsecondary institutions have recently organized, or co-organized, conferences focusing on faculty development related to teaching (Association of American Colleges and Universities 2002; Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges 2001). The AAHE now hosts a special multi-day Colloquium on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning before its annual meeting. AAHE also sponsors an annual Summer Institute for teams from 30-50 institutions to work on institutional change projects. In recent years, many of these projects have dealt with scholarly teaching or the scholarship of teaching.

CONCLUSION

How the emerging trends that we have mentioned will play out in the context of the greedy institution of higher education is difficult to predict. To what extent will the resurgence of attention to teaching and learning add to demands on faculty? Under what conditions might expectations be reorganized to recognize and reward the work of teaching? Will the emerging assessment culture, the potential changes in faculty reward systems, and technological changes in instruction, among other trends, eventually lead to faculty working more efficiently with a set of clearly defined and prioritized outcomes? What variables might affect how

the implementation of these trends interacts with the expanding workload of faculty? What other institutional characteristics affect student experiences and learning, and in what ways?

What can be done to reconcile the needs of greedy institutions with the individual's desire for balance? As this article has indicated, structural support for teaching and learning can create institutional contexts that promote professional development and socialization of new faculty. As a community of sociologists, we can contribute to more effective professional socialization of graduate students and junior faculty, to the creation of institutional and departmental contexts that support teaching and learning, to a reward structure better aligned between institutional goals and faculty talents, and to high-quality work on the scholarship of teaching and learning. No other discipline is so well positioned to study the effect of the structure of the academy on teaching and learning outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Alexander-Snow, Mia and Barbara J. Johnson. 1999. "Perspectives of Faculty of Color." Pp. 88-117 in *Faculty in New Jobs: A Guide to Settling In, Becoming Established, and Building Institutional Support*, edited by Robert J. Menges and Associates. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Arreola, Raoul. 2000. *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System*. 2d ed. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. 2002. Conference on "Faculty Work and Student Learning." November 7-9, Indianapolis, IN. Co-organized by Jerry Berberet, Executive Director of ANAC, and Alma Clayton-Pedersen, VP for Education and Institutional Renewal, AAC&U.
- Astin, Alexander W. 2000. "How the Liberal Arts College Affects Students." Pp. 77-100 in *Distinctively American: The Residential Liberal Arts Colleges*, edited by Steven Koblik and Stephen R. Graubard. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Atkinson, Maxine. 2001. "Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Reconceptualizing Scholarship and Reconceptualizing the Academy." *Social Forces* 79:1217-30.
- Benezet, L.T. 1977. "Uses and Abuses of Departments." Pp. 34-52 in *Academic Departments*, edited by D. E. McHenry. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Benson, Denzel, Wava Haney, Tracy E. Ore, Caroline Hodges Persell, Aileen Schulte, James Steele, and Idee Winfield. 2002. "Thinking Sociologically about Digital Technology, Teaching, and Learning: What We Know and What We Need to Know." *Teaching Sociology* 30:140-57.
- Berberet, Jerry and Linda McMillin. 2002. "The American Professoriate in Transition." *Priorities: Newsletter of the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities* 18:1-15.
- Blau, Peter Michael. 1973. *The Organization of Academic Work*. New York: Wiley.
- Boice, Robert. 1991. "New Faculty as Colleagues." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 4:29-44.
- _____. 1992. *The New Faculty Member: Supporting and Fostering Professional Development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- _____. 1993. "Primal Origins and Later Correctives for Midcareer Disillusionment." Pp. 33-42 in *Developing Senior Faculty as Teachers: New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 55, edited by Martin J. Finkelstein and Mark W. LaCelle-Peterson. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bourque, Susan C. 2000. "Reassessing Research: Liberal Arts Colleges and the Social Sciences." Pp. 265-72 in *Distinctively American: The Residential Liberal Arts Colleges*, edited by Steven Koblik and Stephen R. Graubard. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Boyer, E.L. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Braskamp, Larry and John Ory. 1994. *Assessing Faculty Work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Braxton, J.M., Alan E. Bayer, and Martin J. Finkelstein. 1992. "Teaching Performance Norms in Academia." *Research in Higher Education* 33:533-69.
- Braxton, J.M. and J. B. Berger. 1999. "How Disciplinary Consensus Affects Faculty." Pp. 243-90 in *Faculty in New Jobs: A Guide to Settling In, Becoming Established, and Building Institutional Support*, edited by R. Menges. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bronstein, Phyllis and Lori Farnsworth. 1998.

- "Gender Differences in Faculty Experiences of Interpersonal Climate and Processes for Advancement." *Research in Higher Education* 39:557-85.
- Brownlee, Shannon and Nancy Limon. 1990. "Regional Universities." *US News and World Report*, October 15, pp. 128-30.
- Burke, Dolores L. 1988. *A New Academic Marketplace*. New York: Greenwood.
- Calhoun, Craig. 1999. "The Changing Character of College: Institutional Transformation in American Higher Education." Pp. 9-31 in *The Social Worlds of Higher Education: Handbook for Teaching in a New Century*, edited by Bernice A. Pescosolido and Ronald Aminzade. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge.
- Caplow, Theodore and Reece Jerome McGee. 1958. *The Academic Marketplace*. New York: Science Editions.
- Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. 2002. "Programs in Higher Education." Retrieved December 18, 2003 (<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/CASTL/highered/index.htm>).
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 2000. "Millennial Edition of Carnegie Classification of Institutions in Higher Education." Retrieved December 18, 2003 (<http://carnegiefoundation.org/Classification/index.htm>).
- Chism, Nancy Van Note and Borbala Szabo. 1996. "Who Uses Faculty Development Services?" *To Improve the Academy* 15:115-28.
- Chrislip, David D. and Carl E. Larson. 1994. *Collaborative Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Coser, Lewis A. 1974. *Greedy Institutions: Patterns of Undivided Commitment*. New York: The Free Press.
- Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges. 2001. Annual Meeting on "Faculty Development." June 22-24. Evergreen State College, Olympia, WA.
- Cox, Milton D. 1997. "Long-term Patterns in a Mentoring Program for Junior Faculty: Recommendations for Practice." *To Improve the Academy* 16:225-68.
- Cross, K. Patricia. 2001. "The Three A's in Higher Education: Accessibility, Accountability, and Acceptability." Presented at the annual meeting of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, April, Irvine, CA.
- Cross, K. Patricia and Mimi Harris Steadman. 1996. *Classroom Research: Implementing the Scholarship of Teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cuban, Larry. 1999. *How Scholars Trumped Teachers: Change Without Reform in University Curriculum, Teaching, and Research, 1890-1990*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- The Department Chair: A Newsletter for Academic Administrators* 10. 2000. Bolton, MA.
- DeZure, Deborah. 2000. *Learning from Change: Landmarks in Teaching and Learning in Higher Education from Change Magazine 1969-1999*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Eberts, Paul, Carla B. Howery, Catherine White Berheide, Kathleen Crittenden, Robert Davis, Zelda Gamson, and Theodore C. Wagenaar. 1990. *Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major*. Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association and Association of American College's National Review of Arts and Sciences Majors.
- Edwards, R. 1999. "The Academic Department: How Does it Fit Into the University Reform Agenda?" *Change* 31:16-27.
- Eleser, Christine B. and Sheila W. Chauvin. 1998. "Professional Development How To's: Strategies for Surveying Faculty Preferences." *Innovative Higher Education* 22:181-201.
- Fairweather, James S. 1993. "Faculty Reward Structures: Toward Institutional and Professional Homogenization." *Research in Higher Education* 34:603-23.
- Ferrer deValero, Yaritza. 2001. "Departmental Factors Affecting Time-to-Degree and Completion Rates of Doctoral Students at One Land-Grant Research Institution." *Journal of Higher Education* 72:341-56.
- Finkelstein, Martin J., Robert K. Seal, and Jack H. Schuster. 1998. *The New Academic Generation: A Profession in Transformation*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Finnegan, Dorothy and Zelda Gamson. 1996. "Disciplinary Adaptations to Research Culture in Comprehensive Institutions." *Review of Higher Education* 19:141-77.
- Geiger, Roger. 1980. "The College Curriculum and the Marketplace." *Change* 12:17-23, 54-5.
- Goldsmid, Charles A. and Everett K. Wilson. [1980] 1985. *Passing on Sociology: The Teaching of a Discipline*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Gouldner, A. W. 1957. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 2:281-306, 444-80.
- Harclerod, Fred and Allan Ostar. 1987. *Colleges and Universities for Change*. Washing-

- ton, DC: AASCU Press.
- Huber, Mary Taylor. 1998. *Community College Faculty Attitudes and Trends, 1997*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University School of Education National Center for Postsecondary Improvement.
- Huber, Mary Taylor and Sherwyn Morreale, eds. 2002. *Disciplinary Styles in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Hutchings, Pat and Lee S. Shulman. 1999. "The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: New Elaborations, New Developments." *Change* 31:10-5.
- Kain, Edward L. 2000. Bridging the Gap Between Cultures of Teaching and Cultures of Research. Plenary Address, Southern Sociological Society annual meeting, April, New Orleans, LA.
- Kanter, R. M. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Keith, Bruce and Helen A. Moore. 1995. "Training Sociologists: An Assessment of Professional Socialization and the Emergence of Career Aspirations." *Teaching Sociology* 23:199-214.
- Klug, Hadley G. 1991. "Changes in Curriculum Emphases and the Neglect of Teacher Training in Graduate Departments of Sociology." *Teaching Sociology* 19:430-8.
- Kramer, Laura. 2001. "Engineering Faculty: [Un]Involvement in Student Retention." Presented at the conference Rethinking Gender, Work and Organization, July, Keele University, Staffordshire, England.
- Kramer, Roderick M. 1995. "Divergent Realities and Convergent Disappointments in the Hierarchic Relation: Trust and the Intuitive Auditor at Work." Pp. 216-45 in *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*, edited by Roderick M. Kramer and Tom R. Tyler. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kuh, George and Shouping Hu. 2001. "Learning Productivity at Research Universities." *Journal of Higher Education* 72:1-28.
- Leslie, David W. 2002. "Resolving the Dispute: Teaching Is Academe's Core Value." *Journal of Higher Education* 73:49-73.
- Lucal, Betsy, Cheryl Albers, Jeanne Ballantine, Jodi Burmeister-May, Jeffrey Chin, Sharon Dettmer, and Sharon Larson. 2003. "Faculty Assessment and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Knowledge Available/Knowledge Needed." *Teaching Sociology* 31:146-61.
- Mahaffy, Kimberly A. and Elizabeth M. Caffrey. 2003. "Are Requests for Teaching Credentials Customary? A Content Analysis of the 1999 Employment Bulletin." *Teaching Sociology* 31:203-11.
- Mauksch, Hans O. and Carla Howery. 1986. "Social Change for Teaching: The Case of One Disciplinary Association." *Teaching Sociology* 14:73-82.
- McGee, R. 1971. *Academic Janus: The Private College and Its Faculty*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- McMillin, Linda and Jerry Berberet, eds. 2002. *A New Academic Compact: Re-envisioning the Relationship Between Faculty and Their Institutions*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Meyer, Katrina A., ed. 1998. *Faculty Workload Studies: Perspectives, Needs, and Future Directions, ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 26*. Washington, DC: George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.
- Milem, Jeffrey, Joseph Berger, and Eric Dey. 2000. "Faculty Time Allocation: A Study of Change Over Twenty Years." *The Journal of Higher Education* 71: 454-75.
- National Survey on Student Engagement. 2001. "Improving the College Experience: National Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice." Retrieved December 18, 2003 (<http://www.iub.edu/%7EEnse/html/report-2001.shtml>).
- O'Meara, KerryAnn. 2000. "Climbing the Academic Ladder: Promotion in Rank." Pp. 141-79 in *Policies on Faculty Appointment: Standard Practices and Unusual Arrangements*, edited by C. A. Trower. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Paulsen, Michael B. and Kenneth A. Feldman. 1995. *Taking Teaching Seriously: Meeting the Challenge of Instructional Improvement*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 2. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.
- Pescosolido, Bernice A. and Melissa A. Milkie. 1995. "The Status of Teacher Training in U.S. and Canadian Sociology Departments." *Teaching Sociology* 23:341-52.
- Pescosolido, Bernice A. and Ronald Aminzade, eds. 1999. *The Social Worlds of Higher Education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge.
- Quinn, Jennifer Woods. 1994. "A Norm for Teaching Development: Faculty Perceptions at Five Institutions." Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Education and Social Policy, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.

- Rau, William and Paul J. Baker. 1989. "The Organized Contradictions of Academe: Barriers Facing the Next Academic Revolution." *Teaching Sociology* 17:161-75.
- Sacks, Howard and Terry Weiner. 1978. *Some Problems of Teaching Sociology in Small Departments and Some Tentative Solutions*. Washington, DC: ASA Teaching Resources Center.
- Sandy, Leo R., Scott Meyer, Gary E. Goodnough, and Anissa T. Rogers. 2000. "Faculty Perceptions of the Importance of Pedagogy as Faculty Development." *Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development* 17:39-50.
- Schmidt, Peter. 2000. "States Set a Course for Higher Education Systems." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 46:A27.
- Schuster, Jack and Daniel Wheeler and Associates. 1990. *Enhancing Faculty Careers*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schwartz, Martin D. 1990. "Dropping the Study in Depth Charge at the University Level." *Teaching Sociology* 18:488-98.
- Scott, Joyce A. and Nancy A. Bereman. 1992. "Competition versus Collegiality: Academe's Dilemma for the 1990s." *Journal of Higher Education* 63:684-98.
- Seldin, Peter. 1990. "Academic Environments and Teaching Effectiveness." Pp. 3-22 in *How Administrators Can Improve Teaching: Moving From Talk to Action in Higher Education*, edited by Peter Seldin. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- _____. ed. 1995. *Improving College Teaching*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- _____. 1999. *Changing Practices in Evaluating Teaching*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Shulman, Lee. 1989. "Toward a Pedagogy of Substance." *AAHE Bulletin* 41:8-13.
- _____. 1993. "Teaching as Community Property." *Change* 20:6-7.
- Slaughter, Sheila. 1993. "Retrenchment in the 1980s: The Politics of Prestige and Gender." *Journal of Higher Education* 64:250-82.
- Smith, Barbara Leigh and Myrna J. Smith. 1993. "Revitalizing Senior Faculty Through Statewide Efforts." Pp. 21-32 in *Developing Senior Faculty as Teachers: New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 55, edited by Martin J. Finkelstein and Mark W. LaCelle-Peterson. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Spangler, Mary, Karen Grosz, Nancy Byrnes, Ron Harlan, and Ofelia Romero-Motlaugh. 1991. *Caught in "Upward Drift": An Assessment of Comprehensive Universities and Colleges*. Report to U.S. Department of Education. ERIC Clearinghouse No. ED333777.
- Stanley, Christine A., M. Erin Porter, and Borbala L. Szabo. 1997. "An Exploratory Study of The Faculty-Client Relationship." *Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development* 14:115-32.
- Sullivan, Teresa A. 1991. "Making the Graduate Curriculum Explicit." *Teaching Sociology* 19:408-13.
- Tierney, William G. 1997. "Organizational Socialization in Higher Education." *Review of Higher Education* 68:1-16.
- Tierney, William G. and Estela Mara Bensimon. 1996. *Promotion and Tenure: Community and Socialization in Academe*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Tierney, William G. and Robert A. Rhoads. 1994. *Faculty Socialization as Cultural Process*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 93-6. Washington, DC: George Washington School of Education and Human Development.
- Trautvetter, Lois Calian. 1999. "Experiences of Women, Experiences of Men." Pp. 59-87 in *Faculty in New Jobs: A Guide to Settling In, Becoming Established, and Building Institutional Support*, edited by Robert J. Menges and Associates. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Trower, Cathy A., Ann E. Austin, and Mary Deane Sorcinelli. 2001. "Paradise Lost: How the Academy Converts Enthusiastic Recruits into Early-Career Doubters." *AAHE Bulletin* 53:3-6.
- Weiner, Mary Ellen, ed. 1990. *Improving College Teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Weiss, Gregory, Janet Cosbey, Shelley K. Habel, Chad M. Hanson, and Carolee Larson. 2002. "Improving the Assessment of Student Learning: Advancing a Research Agenda in Sociology." *Teaching Sociology* 30:53-62.
- Whitt, Elizabeth J. 1991. "Hit the Ground Running: Experiences of New Faculty in a School of Education." *Review of Higher Education* 14:177-97.
- "Why Is Research the Rule? The Impact of Incentive Systems on Faculty Behavior." 2000. *Change* 32:53.
- Wilson, Robin. 2002. "Faculty Members Care More About Students, Less About Prestige, Study Finds." *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved December 18, 2003 (<http://chronicle.com/daily/2002/11/2002110104n.htm>).

Woods, Jennifer Quinn. 1999. "Establishing a Teaching Development Culture." Pp. 268-90 in *Faculty in New Jobs*, edited by Robert J. Menges and Associates. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Wright, Mary C. 2002. "Always at Odds? Congruence in Faculty Beliefs about Teaching at a Research University." Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

Wright, R. A. 1986. "Professorial Role Strains in the Small College: Issues and Opportunities." Pp. 28-37 in *Teaching in the Small College: Issues and Applications*, edited by R. Wright and J. Burden. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Wright, W. Alan, ed. 1995. *Teaching Improvement Practices: Successful Strategies for Higher Education*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Wright, W. Alan and M. Carol O'Neil. 1995. "Teaching Improvement Practices: International Perspectives." Pp. 1-57 in *Teaching Improvement Practices: Successful Strategies for Higher Education*, edited by W. Alan Wright. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Mary Wright is an instructional consultant at the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT) at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. She recently received her Ph.D. from the University of Michigan. Her scholarly interests include research university faculty beliefs about teaching, gender and student evaluations, and classroom research.

Nandini Assar is a community educator at the Voluntary Action Center of the New River Valley in Christiansburg, Virginia. She works with community-based organizations to build capacity. Her academic areas of interest are political economy, gender analysis, migration studies, and civic engagement. She completed her Ph.D. in 2000, and after several years of teaching at Virginia Tech, her interest in civic education and service learning drew her to work with community agencies.

Edward L. Kain is University Scholar and Professor of Sociology at Southwestern University in George-

town, Texas. His research includes examinations of social change and families, the undergraduate curriculum in sociology, and a variety of issues related to teaching. He is a member of the ASA Department Resources Group and serves on the ASA Task Force on the Undergraduate Major.

Laura Kramer is a professor of sociology and women's studies at Montclair State University in New Jersey. Her interests include gender, work, and higher education. Most recently, Kramer investigated the teaching role of engineering faculty. She is a member of the ASA Department Resources Group, leads faculty development workshops for the New Jersey Project, and serves as an outside evaluator of the NSF-ADVANCE Program at New Mexico State University,

Carla B. Howery is the Deputy Executive Officer of the American Sociological Association where she directs the Academic and Professional Affairs Program. She has been on the ASA professional staff for 22 years working primarily on teaching and higher education issues.

Kathleen McKinney is Cross Chair in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and professor of sociology at Illinois State University. Her research interests include teaching and learning in higher education, human sexuality, and personal relationships. McKinney has served as past editor of *Teaching Sociology* and is currently a member of the ASA Department Resources Group and the ASA Task Force on the Undergraduate Major.

Becky Glass is Associate Professor of Sociology and inaugural Director of the Teaching and Learning Center at SUNY-Geneseo. Her research interests include development and population, family sociology, and faculty development and evaluation. She is a member of the ASA Department Resources Group.

Maxine P. Atkinson is an associate professor at North Carolina State University. She teaches the graduate course required for Preparing Future Faculty certification titled "Teaching Sociology" and coordinates the department's "Integrating Data Analysis" program for undergraduates. Her research focuses on the scholarship of teaching and learning and sociology of the family.